



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE LAY OF ELIDUC AND THE LEGEND OF THE HUSBAND WITH TWO WIVES

I

In the city of Erfurt in Thuringia there is preserved a sculptured stone, originally the top of a tomb showing the figure of a knight reclining between two women. Tradition has it that the central figure in this group represents a count of Gleichen, who had left his wife and children in 1227 to join the crusade of Frederic II. Made a prisoner, he became the slave of the Turkish sultan and would have remained so until his death, had not the daughter of the Mohammedan fallen in love with the handsome Christian and planned for his freedom on condition that he would marry her and lead her to his home. His answer that he had left a wife and children behind him made naturally no impression upon the young Mohammedan woman, who retorted that among the Turks it was customary for one husband to have two and even more wives. In this dilemma the count decided to accept her offer, to observe his marriage vow in fact though he broke it in form, and to appeal to the pope on his passage through Rome for pardon for his sin. According to his expectations the pope not only pardoned the deed but also authorized the continuance of the bigamous relation. Protected by this official sanction, he continued his journey to his home, and there the first wife, when she understood the service rendered to her husband in his captivity, accepted gladly and readily the newcomer and the count lived for many years in peace and joy with his two wives and was finally buried between them.¹

The earliest mention of this tradition is found in the sixteenth century. There is evidence, however, that the legend itself of the husband with two wives is older, for we have a similar story in France, told with all the essential features, in a prose text of the

¹ Reineck, *Die Sage von der Doppelehe eines Grafen von Gleichen*, Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge. Hrsg. von Virchow und Wattenbach, Heft 133, Hamburg, 1892; Bayot, *Le roman de Gillion de Trazegnies*, Louvain, 1903, pp. 80 ff.

fifteenth century, of a knight of the family of Trazegnies,¹ and this prose text in all probability derives from a lost poem of the fourteenth century.

Here also the story is attached to the tomb of a man buried between two women. The author relates that on a visit to the abbey *de l'Olive* in the Hainaut he saw three tombs, and upon inquiring for the names of the people buried there he learned that these were the tombs of Gillion de Trazegnies and his two wives. The abbot then gave him a book from which he translated his story, which is as follows:

Gillion was a knight of the court of the count of Hainaut, married to a cousin of the latter, Marie d'Ostrevant. Having no heir he made the vow to undertake a journey to the Holy Land if God would grant his prayer to give them a child, and when this wish was about to be realized, he set out on this pilgrimage even before the child had been born. He visited the Holy Sepulcher, but on the journey homeward fell into the hands of the sultan of Egypt, who led him to Babylon and held him prisoner for a period of twenty years. During that time he made himself indispensable to the sultan by his strength and power of leadership, and Gracienne, the daughter of the Saracen, attracted by his handsome appearance, fell in love with him and was instrumental in saving his life. Presently the sultan was attacked by Isidore de Damas, a rejected suitor for the hand of Gracienne, and Gillion managed to win a decisive victory for the sultan. Then Gracienne offered him her love and accepted the Christian faith, and when Gillion received what he had every reason to believe to be authentic information concerning the death of his wife, he married the Saracen girl. But Marie d'Ostrevant had not died. She had given birth to twins, and when these after twenty years had grown up to manhood, they set out in search of their father. After many adventures they finally discovered him in the Saracen city. When Gillion heard that his wife was still living he at once demanded permission to return to his home, and Gracienne decided to accompany him. They journeyed by way of Rome, where she

¹ Wolff, *Histoire de Gilion de Trasignyes et de dame Marie sa femme*, Leipzig, 1839; Bayot, *op. cit.*

was a second time baptized by the pope, though no confession was made of her marriage to Gillion and no dispensation was given by the pope to continue the bigamous relation. On their arrival at Trazegnies the first wife received the party joyfully, and when informed of the love of Gracienne and her share in the salvation of Gillion she at once announced her readiness to cede her place to the newcomer. But Gracienne was equally noble and refused to listen to such a sacrifice. Both women entered the same monastery where they lived together until their death, and Gillion withdrew to the abbey of Cambray. Before his death a call for help came to him from the sultan of Babylon to which he responded and in that expedition he died. According to his will, however, his heart was sent back to France and buried in the same tomb between the bodies of his two wives.

It is evident that barring the dénouement and minor details the two stories are identical. The problem is to discover their relation and if possible the source of this tradition. A prominent phase of the investigation is concerned with the question which of the two stories shows the older form of the dénouement. In the German story the husband lives with both wives; in the French version both withdraw to the same nunnery to finish their days.

It was Gaston Paris who first called attention to this legend of the husband with two wives in a paper read in 1887 before the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, which he later reproduced in his volume *La Poésie du Moyen-âge, deuxième série*, Paris, 1895.¹ He emphasized there the similarity which it shows with Marie de France's lay of *Eliduc*, "le chef-d'œuvre de Marie de France et l'une des œuvres les plus poétiques que nous ait laissées le moyen-âge." Quite recently the French prose *Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies* was made the subject of a detailed examination by Alphonse Bayot of the University of Louvain in the monograph already cited, and this scholar came to the conclusion that the German story is younger than and derives from the French, and that the French story has its direct source in Marie's lay. Gaston Paris limited his comparison to the three stories mentioned

¹ Pp. 109-30, 2d ed., Paris, 1905.

so far, and added to them the legend of *Griselidis*. Yet this last-mentioned story does not properly belong in the cycle of the legend of the husband with two wives except inasmuch as Griselidis accepts her disgrace and the substitution of another wife in her place. In all other respects the plot is entirely different. The second marriage is here the last of a series of trials all intended to show the heroine's humility, and this element does not properly enter into the stories which relate various forms of the legend under consideration. However, the cycle as such is larger. Besides the *Roman d'Ille et Galeron* mentioned in a note by Gaston Paris, it includes the story of *Horn et Rimenhild* as well as episodes from *Bueve de Haumtone* and the *Tristan* legend, and if our point of view is correct Marie de France's *Lai du Fraisne* and the *Roman de Galeran* in some particulars are also closely related to it.

Gautier d'Arras' *Roman d'Ille et Galeron* has so far been looked upon merely as a variant of the lay of *Eliduc*, inasmuch as it was believed to represent a conscious reversal of its main motive undertaken by the author in order to correct the immorality of the Celtic story. However, in an article published in *Modern Philology*, IV, pp. 471-88, I have tried to show that this point of view is inaccurate, and that this *roman d'aventure* rests indeed as the author claims upon a lost lay with the same title, which bore striking resemblance to the song of *Horn et Rimenhild*. It is the interrelation of these different stories and the formation of the legend of the husband with two wives which we shall try to elucidate in the following pages.

II

The most convenient starting-point for our discussion will be a portion of the outline of the *Ille et Galeron* story reduced to its lowest terms, as we posited it in the article referred to on p. 482. A youth unknown and deprived of his heritage arrives at a court, where he distinguishes himself by his bravery and is raised to an important office. In consequence a princess falls in love with him, and the two are married. Presently, they are separated. The knight journeys to another court, where similar scenes are re-enacted, but he remains steadfast to his first love.

It is evident that we have here a type of story made up by the repetition of the same simple theme. All the essential features of the first half are duplicated in the second. Now we have at least one Old French poem in which this theme appears in its simple form, and that is the *Mainet*¹ in which the *enfances* of Charlemagne are related. An outline of this poem is as follows:

Charles, persecuted by Heudri and Rainfroi his treacherous half-brothers, makes his escape before the age of fifteen, together with nine companions, among whom is his faithful servant David, and arrives at Toledo at the court of King Galafre. Here he takes on the name of *Mainet*, at once distinguishes himself by his bravery and kills Caïmant, the commander of the army which is just then attacking Galafre. At the court he attracts the attention of all by his courtesy and Galienne, Galafre's daughter, falls in love with him. Then the Saracen king convokes his barons, makes public recognition of the valor of Mainet, and announces his intention of dubbing him a knight and bestowing upon him a portion of his land and the hand of his daughter, though she is sought in marriage by thirty kings, among whom Braimant is the most prominent. Mainet accepts all these offers and promises to present to Galafre the head of Braimant. A battle soon follows in which he meets this condition, and Galafre then prepares to fulfil his promise. Now traitors malign Mainet, telling Galafre that he had sworn to overthrow him and seize his realm as soon as he had become the husband of Galienne. A further plot to do bodily harm to Mainet is foiled through the aid of Galienne and all manage to escape. After a successful expedition to Rome Mainet returns and marries Galienne.

We shall now attempt to show that several of the poems of our group show all the essential features of this version of the exile-and-return formula, but in reduplication. And we may add that it is in this doubling that according to our belief the starting-point of our legend must be seen. The simplest form of this new type of story is apparently represented by the song of *Horn et Rimenhild*.²

¹ Cf. Gaston Paris, *Romania*, IV, pp. 305-37.

² The story of Horn and Rimenhild has come down to us in two versions, the Anglo-Norman poem published by Brede and Stengel in *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*, Marburg, 1885, and the Early English *King Horn* edited by McKnight for the Early English Text Society in 1901,

Driven from home by national enemies Horn arrives at the age of ten (of fifteen in the English version) with a crowd of companions given as fifteen in the French, twelve in the English version, in the land of Hunlaf, king of Suddene. As his beauty and courtesy become known, Rigmel, the king's daughter, falls in love with him. In a war which follows Horn has the opportunity to show his valor. He is knighted, in this instance before the war actually begins, though, as in the *Mainet*, here also the war is the immediate cause for the ceremony, and he becomes *conestable* of the realm. Before the consent of the king to Horn's marriage with Rigmel, which is implied in the general tone of the story, in view of the signal favors which the king shows to the young knight, though it is not actually expressed, is given, Horn is maligned before the king, the accusation being that he had betrayed the girl and was planning to usurp the king's place. In consequence he is driven into exile. He now goes to the court of Gudreche, king of Westir, where he lives under the assumed name of Gudmod. His story in these new surroundings is essentially the same as that in Hunlaf's court. Lenburc, Gudreche's daughter, falls in love with him. Like Rigmel she makes advances which Gudmod repels. Presently Gudreche is attacked by enemies, and Gudmod can give evidence of his prowess and gain a victory. In consequence Gudreche decides to give Lenburc to Gudmod as his wife and to make him his heir. Gudmod, however, remains faithful to his first love. Soon afterward he receives news that Hunlaf is on the point of marrying Rigmel to another suitor, and giving up his fictitious name he returns to Suddene and frustrates the plans for the wedding which is already in progress.

The duplication of which we have spoken is evident in this outline,¹ and the points of contact with the story of *Mainet* are also striking. To be sure the story of Horn is not an exact duplicate in each of its two halves of the simpler *Mainet* story. While

both deriving from the same lost Anglo-Norman source. For the latest discussion of this story and the problems connected with it, cf. Schofield, "The Story of Horn and Rimenhild," in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XVIII, pp. 1-83.

¹ It goes without saying that I do not wish to declare that the song of *Horn* is the result of a doubling of the *Mainet*. The relative age of the two poems does not affect the explanation offered here. What they have in common is the literary formula upon which they are based, and this appears in simple form in the one and is reduplicated in the other.

it is clear that the main motive is used twice, details may be found in the first or second half, without, however, affecting the validity of our contention. We may point out, therefore, that in both poems the temporary separation of the knight from his lady is caused by the malice of enemies, that Horn lives at Gudreche's court under the assumed name of Gudmod, as Charles under that of Mainet at the court of Galafre, and that the plan of Gudreche to marry Gudmod to his daughter and make him his heir is quite the counterpart even in detail of the similar project of Galafre to unite Mainet and Galienne.

There is an additional point of resemblance between the two stories which should be emphasized. In *Mainet* the young knight distinguishes himself in two encounters, first against enemies that beset Galafre at the time of his arrival, and later against a rejected suitor for the hand of Galienne. In the song of *Horn* there is only one war at either court in which Horn wins victory for his protector, and in both instances the attack is dictated by the desire for conquest. However, this variation is not of vital importance, for we shall see rejected suitors in evidence under similar conditions in other texts of our group, and I have little doubt that this was the cause assigned for the war in the older forms of the *Horn and Rimenhild* story. There is, moreover, a most striking agreement in the English version of the song of *Horn* with the story of Mainet at this very point. Galafre proposed the marriage with Galienne to Mainet on condition that he would bring him the head of Braimant, the rejected suitor. The English poem relates that Horn, having gained the love of Rimenhild, mounts his black steed and sets out for adventure. Riding along the seashore he finds pagan enemies who had come for the conquest of the land. At once he draws his sword and begins a battle in which he kills a hundred of the enemies and gains a decisive victory. Then he hews off the leader's head, fixes it on his sword and returns to the king's hall where he relates his adventure.¹ The agreement and its setting are too close to be due to accident.

We may now turn our attention to the *Roman d'Ille et*

¹ Cf. *King Horn*, ll. 659-82.

Galeron.¹ In my previous article already referred to I called attention to the fact that this poem in its central section, which shows the story of the source, called the *lai d'Ille et Galeron* by Gautier d'Arras, relates a story representing striking similarities to the song of *Horn*. As a matter of fact the relation between the two is much closer than I intimated there. Their relation is so vital that *mutatis mutandis* the one may be looked upon as a replica of the other. The proof of this statement lies in the following detailed comparison of the two poems:

Horn

1. Horn, at the age of ten and after his father's death, is driven from home and arrives at the court of Hunlaf in Suddene, where he lives until he is knighted.
2. Horn arrives at Hunlaf's court with fifteen companions according to the French version. The English version gives this number as twelve.

In the French version Horn has one particular friend, Haderof by name. In the English poem he has two companions, Hathulf (= Haderof) and Fikenhild. Since Wikele, the latter's counterpart in the French version, is not mentioned until l. 1839 and then without previous introduction, it is more than likely that the English version has here, as in other instances, preserved the better reading, and that in the source of the French poem also Horn had two companions, Haderof and Wikele.

Ille et Galeron

1. Ille, at the age of ten and after his father's death, flees to the court of the king of France, where he lives until he is knighted.
2. The number of Ille's companions is not specified, but later, when he has been knighted and sets out to regain his heritage, he starts out with twelve companions (l. 329) of whom two have been mentioned before (l. 194) as his particular friends with whom he had frequented many tournaments.

¹ Ed. by Förster, Halle, 1891.

Horn

3. Rigmel, Hunlaf's daughter, falls in love with Horn and makes advances.
4. Horn objects that he is a poor orphan and that Rigmel should select a rich king for her husband.
5. Horn wins a victory for Hunlaf and on the demand of his men becomes *conestable* of the realm.
The king is apparently ignorant of the relation of Horn and his daughter. Yet he places the most absolute trust in him and loves him as his own child.
6. In the argument which takes place between Horn and Rigmel, when the latter offers him her love, she encourages him to plan for the conquest of his inheritance and assures him that he will be successful.
7. Hunlaf is old and feeble (l. 1752).
8. Horn leaves Rigmel and goes to the court of Gudreche in Westir, where he lives unrecognized.
9. He hides his identity and takes on the name of Gudmod.
10. Gudreche is old and feeble (l. 3573).

Ille et Galeron

3. At the court of Conain, where Ille arrives after leaving the court of the king of France, Galeron, the count's sister, falls in love with him. He reciprocates the feeling, but neither dares to confess this passion.
4. Ille does not dare to confess his love to Galeron because of her high station (l. 1220).
5. Ille proves himself so invaluable to Conain that he decides to retain him permanently at his court. He makes him *senescal* of Bretagne and gives him his sister as wife.
6. Ille makes the final conquest of his inheritance after the time when Galeron's love for him has become apparent and before Conain decides on the marriage of the two.
7. Conain is called *le foible duc* (l. 157).
8. Ille leaves Galeron and goes to the court of the emperor of Rome, where his identity is unknown.
9. Ille does not assume a pseudonym, but he hides his identity, claims he is no knight but a simple squire and of humble station (cf. ll. 2029-32, 2043-47, 2054).
10. The emperor of Rome is old (l. 2004) and feeble (l. 2007).

Horn

11. Gudreche's realm is attacked by enemies.
12. Horn leads Gudreche's army, divided into seven sections, in the battle which follows.
13. After the victory Gudreche decides to give Horn his daughter Lenburc as wife and to make him his heir.
14. Gudreche seeks the advice of his brother-in-law, the king of Orkenie, and the latter proposes the king's plan to Horn.
15. Horn rejects the proposal and when chided for his folly speaks of his former love in Suddene to whom he had promised to return.
16. Before giving a decisive answer Horn wishes to find out whether Rigmel has kept her faith. Then he receives news which leads him to disclose his identity, and he sets out for Suddene to break up the forced marriage of Rigmel.
17. When Lenburc learns that her marriage with Horn is impossible, she announces her desire to enter a monastery.
18. When Horn leaves Rigmel he promises to return if he should hear of Hunlaf's distress.

Ille et Galeron

11. The emperor of Greece comes with an army to attack Rome.
12. Ille is acclaimed *senescal* by the knights on the battlefield (cf. Horn's similar position, No. 5 above), and as commander he divides the Roman army into ten sections.
13. As a result of this victory Ille is confirmed *senescal* by the emperor, and in order to reward him and at the same time to make the bond of union between them stronger, the emperor decides to give him his daughter as wife and to make him his heir.
14. The emperor intrusts the pope with the task of making the proposition to Ille.
15. Ille rejects the proposal and the pope chides him for his folly. Thereupon he confesses that he has a wife living in Bretagne.
16. Messengers are sent to Bretagne to gather information concerning the whereabouts of Galeron. She appears in Rome in time to hinder the marriage of Ille and Ganor.
17. Galeron enters a monastery at the end, and thus Ille becomes free to marry Ganor.
18. When Ille leaves Ganor in company with his wife he promises to return if she or her country should need his aid.

The parallelisms pointed out in the preceding pages are so convincing, particularly those noted under Nos. 2, 12, 13, 14, and 15, that any attempt to strengthen the evident conclusion by additional argument is unnecessary. We may, therefore, turn our attention at once to the lay of *Eliduc*.¹ The skeleton of this story will be found to resemble the *Mainet* motive and its counterpart, the song of *Horn*.

With ten companions Eliduc arrives as a stranger at the court of the king of Exeter, whom he finds sorely pressed by a rejected suitor for the hand of his daughter. Through his strength and efficiency the adversary is overcome, and in consequence Eliduc becomes the king's chief officer (*gardein de la tere*, l. 270), and the princess falls in love with him.

While the relation to the *Mainet* motive so far is evident there is nevertheless an important variation to be noted. Eliduc is not a child deprived of his heritage and exiled from his native land. He is already married and leaves behind a wife to whom he has promised faith and a speedy return. Yet when we look more closely at the beginning of this lay we shall notice that Eliduc at his home occupies evidently the same position of *gardein de la tere*, which he wins for himself with the king of Exeter (cf. l. 34), that he is forced to leave his home through the machinations of malicious and envious enemies (ll. 40 ff.), and that he had evidently earned this position through his valor, for the lay says that the king *pur sa pruëse le retint* (l. 35). In other words, when looked at from this point of view, the lay begins at a point corresponding exactly to the middle of the similar outline of the song of *Horn*. It looks, therefore, as if the Eliduc story had originally been built up like the song of *Horn*, and that in the form in which we have it the larger portion of the first link in the duplication had been dropped. This lost section could, however, easily be supplied on the basis of the other stories of our group. Let us suppose that Eliduc in his youth was driven from home by enemies or traitors and took refuge at the court of his Breton king. Soon after his arrival this king was attacked by enemies, presumably rejected suitors for the hand of his daughter, and Eliduc

¹ Warnke, *Die Lais der Marie de France*, 2d ed., Halle, 1900, pp. 186-224.

was instrumental in winning a decisive victory for him. The princess thereupon fell in love with the youth, and the king equally appreciative of his valor, dubbed him a knight, bestowed the hand of his daughter upon him and made him guardian of his realm and his heir. Now enemies maligned him and he must leave the land. We note that the lay does not specify the nature of the accusation, but on the basis of the *Mainet* story we might suppose that they accused him of plotting to usurp the reign. If an introduction of this nature were added to the *Eliduc* lay we should have a story which is in all essentials the counterpart of the song of *Horn*, barring of course the difference that Eliduc is married while Horn is not, which affects the incidents of the story, but not the skeleton in which these are made to fit. Eliduc does not live under an assumed name at the court of the king of Exeter, but his antecedents are unknown, and just as Gudmod at the court of Gudreche so Eliduc here creates his position and wins the love of Guilliadun entirely through his personal valor. Now all this, to be sure, is supposition for which the direct proof is probably beyond reach. The wife of Eliduc does not appear to be the daughter of his king, though she is said to be *noble* (l. 9), and there is no hint whatever of any previous history of Eliduc in the lay which Marie wrote. Yet on the other hand, Marie tells us that her lay had formerly borne a different title. While now it is known by the name of *Guildeluëc ha Guilliadun* it was formerly called *Eliduc* (ll. 21-26). We have thus most conclusive evidence of the existence of this lay under a different title. That this different title also implies a different form of the story cannot be affirmed with equal certainty, but it seems to me the facts which I have presented in the preceding pages create at least a strong presumption that such was the case. It does not follow that Marie abridged the story herself. Yet it is certain that the two incidents of the shipwreck and the resuscitation in her lay are not referred to in the short synopsis (ll. 5-28) which she prefixed to the story proper. I called attention to this fact in my previous article (p. 474), and added that it would help the theory if it could be assumed that her omission of any reference to these two episodes was proof that they represented her additions, but that there was not suffi-

cient evidence to warrant such an inference. Granting that she related the story as she heard it, we may ask, however, why she should have made mention of the earlier form of the story, if her own version of it did not vary from the other. And to this question, it seems to me, the present explanation offers an entirely plausible answer. The earlier *Eliduc* story was similar to the song of *Horn* and contained both links of the duplication. The lay of Marie represents an abridgment made either by herself or by a Celtic *conteur* and in this process of alteration it attracted the two episodes mentioned above for which no counterpart or explanation can be found in the group of poems to which the *Eliduc* lay clearly belongs.

In this list of poems showing a knight in contact with several women, there should finally be mentioned the *Roman de Galeran*,¹ though this story is not built up at all along the lines which we have been discussing. Already betrothed to Fraïsne Galeran appears at the court of the duke of Metz, and Esmerée the latter's daughter promptly falls in love with him and makes the usual advances, which are rejected by the young knight, who remains true to the memory of his first love. There follows a battle against a rejected suitor for the hand of Esmerée in which Galeran is victorious. Soon after, leaving the court of Metz, he comes to the castle of Brundoré where he meets Florie, the sister of Fraïsne. This portion of the poem is based upon a different theme, whose relation to the former we shall discuss in our next chapter.

III

By the side of the motive discussed in the preceding pages and probably causing the duplication which we have observed, another motive was current which was in no wise related to the former, but which was presently closely interwoven with it.

The general form of this theme may be stated as follows: Due to the deceptive similarity of two persons of the same sex, confusion is brought into their relation with a member of the other sex.

As an example of this motive we may cite first an incident

¹ Published by Boucherie, Montpellier, 1888.

in the story of *Amis and Amiles*.¹ These two friends, born at the same moment, bear such a striking resemblance to each other that even their closest friends cannot distinguish them. Ami is married to a relative of the traitor Hardré. Amile, in love with the daughter of Charlemagne, is accused by Hardré of having betrayed the princess. He protests his innocence, but since he is not as blameless as he pretends to be, Ami takes his place in the duel in which he is supposed to defend his innocence. Ami, of course, comes out the victor, and in consequence he is married to the princess, while his own wife in the meantime falls in love with Amile, whom she takes to be her husband. We have thus in this story, when looked at from this point of view, an example of the husband with two wives, in which the irregular relation is partly due to physical resemblance.

It is this same motive which we can observe distinctly in the poems under consideration. In the original form of it the resemblance was probably conceived as being due to birth at the same time from the same mother. If this conception of its origin is correct, we can see it preserved in its purest form in the *Roman de Galeran*, which we have just cited as being in part based upon the exile motive of *Mainet* and *Horn*.

Here twins are born to the wife of Brundoré and separated immediately because the mother fears the accusation of adultery.² One of the twins is called Fraisne after the ash tree, in which she is found after her exposure by a trusty servant. The other, who remains with the mother, is called Florie. Fraisne is reared in the cloister before whose doors she was discovered, and becomes the sweetheart of Galeran, the nephew of the abbess, with whom she grows up. When later Galeran is separated from Fraisne, the story puts him in contact first with Esmerée, daughter of the duke of Metz. Here prominent features of the exile formula are made use of. Esmerée makes advances and Galeran defeats a rejected suitor. Later he meets Florie, the twin sister of Fraisne, and here the knight, who showed himself disdainful and ready to repel the

¹ Published by Hofmann, Erlangen, 1852.

² For a discussion of this widespread theme cf. Köhler in Warnke, *Die Lais der Marie de France*, 2d ed., pp. lxxxvii ff.

advances of Esmerée, at once succumbs to the memories which the resemblance of Florie to Fraisne awakens in him. Even at the first interview he forgets all proprieties and tries to take Florie in his arms and kiss her, all for the memory of Fraisne.¹ And later, when the marriage between him and Florie is decided upon, he accepts it solely for the memory of Fraisne whom he constantly sees in Florie.²

It is important to note that the resemblance in this story is, on the one hand, described directly and, on the other, also indicated by the names of the two girls; for there can be little question that the two words *Fraisne* and *Florie* are intended for that purpose.

Resemblance both in name and fact is, however, distinctly the center of this theme in the form in which it appears in the following episode in the Tristan story. Tristan is forced to leave the court of Marc, and after a long journey through different lands he arrives in Bretagne where he makes the acquaintance of Kaherdin and his sister Isolt aux Blanches Mains. At this point Bédier³ accepts Gottfried of Strassburg as showing the original form of the story and he gives the following wording as representing the substance of this passage in the Thomas version: "Elle rappelait sans cesse à Tristan l'autre Isolt, Isolt d'Irlande, et parcequ'elle s'appelait Isolt, ce nom le faisait si troublé et si joyeux, quand ces regards tombaient sur elle, que l'on pouvait voir dans ses yeux l'émoi de son cœur." The parallel which this episode presents with the story whose growth we are studying is important. It differs from it in detail, but not in spirit. Tristan, when he marries Isolt aux Blanches Mains breaks his faith with the other Isolt as much as does Eliduc, when he is ready to carry Guilliadun away from her father's castle.⁴

That this theme is at work in the poems of our group appears clearly from the song of *Horn*. In the French form of that story all trace of it has disappeared and the two princesses with whom Horn comes in contact are called Rigmel and Lenburc, but these

¹ Cf. ll. 5221 ff.

² Cf. ll. 6440 ff.

³ *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas*, publié par J. Bédier, Paris, 1902, p. 258.

⁴ Some very interesting and striking additional points of resemblance between the Tristan legend and the song of *Horn* were recently pointed out by Miss Weston in *Romania* XXXV, pp. 524, 525, 526.

are not the names of the original story. In the English version the name of the first appears in a variety of forms which all seem to be based on an original *Rimenhild*, a name which is derived from the AS *Irmenhild* or *Eormenhild*. The second is called *Reynild* with slight variations in two of the manuscripts in which this version has come down to us, but in the third manuscript this girl is called *Ermenhild*. When we consider the fact that this is the very manuscript in which other names of the original form of the story have been preserved, such as *Aaluf*, *Gudmod*, and *Fykel*, which agree with the French version but are changed to *Murry*, *Cutberd*, and *Fikenhild* in the other English manuscripts, the evidence is very strong that *Ermenhild* also belongs to the original form of the story. The bearing of this fact was clearly seen by Schofield in his study on the *Story of Horn and Rimenhild*,¹ who compared the two *Rimenhilds* of this story to the two *Isolts* of the *Tristan* legend. It follows that the song of *Horn* in its early form must have contained the same resemblance theme which we have observed in the *Roman de Galeran*.

With these facts in mind we can understand why in the *Lai du Fraisne*, which is the direct source of the *Roman de Galeran*, the two girls with whom *Gurun* is associated are called *Le Fraisne* and *La Coldre*, the ash and the hazel, and we have also found the meaning of the evident alliteration in the names of *Galeran* and *Ganor* in *Ille et Galeron* and of *Guildeluëc* and *Guilliadun* in the *Eliduc* lay. All reference to the physical resemblance has disappeared, while the method of expressing it has remained.

IV

We have now reached a point from which we are enabled to view the lay of *Eliduc* and the other texts which we are studying at a new angle. In all of them we find a knight brought in contact with two maidens. When grouped with reference to the attitude of the hero and the dénouement these stories submit to the following fourfold division.

1. The knight is not married to the first maiden but succumbs to the resemblance to her which the appearance of the second

¹ *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XVIII, p. 35.

maiden suggests. The texts belonging here are the *Lai du Fraisne*, *Galeran*, and *Tristan*. It will be noticed that the exile formula as such is absent here and that the stories are based solely on the resemblance theme.

2. The knight is not married to the first maiden and remains true to her, illustrated by the song of *Horn*.¹

3. The knight is married to the first maiden and succumbs to the charms of the second, illustrated by *Eliduc*.

4. The knight is married to the first maiden and remains true to his vows. Here belong *Ille et Galeron*, the lost lay from which it derives, and the episodes from *Bueve de Haumtone* discussed in my previous article (*loc. cit.*, pp. 484 ff.).

Without recognizing the relation between these types Förster tried to prove that type 4 represents a reversal, made on moral grounds, of type 3. The evidence of my previous article and the arguments brought forward in the present discussion have shown that this point of view is no longer tenable. *Ille et Galeron* appears to be a reversal of *Eliduc* only if the final marriage of Ille with Ganor, which is entirely foreign to the story proper, is accepted as being its logical end. The present grouping shows that *Ille et Galeron* has the solution of both types 3 and 4. Hence one of the two, and evidently the second, must be a later addition. The accuracy of this contention will appear more clearly if it can be shown that *Bueve de Haumtone*, the other poem in this group, shows a skeleton similar to that which *Ille et Galeron* had in its simpler form.

There can be no question that the central plot of the Beves story is based on the exile formula. A brief outline will reveal all the characteristic features with which we have become familiar in the earlier portions of this paper. Driven from home, Beves arrives, after various adventures, at the court of King Hermin, whose daughter Josiane promptly falls in love with him and makes the usual advances. Presently Beves is maligned and accused of having betrayed Josiane. The king sends him into a foreign land bearing a message which is to throw him into prison for life.

¹ A variation of this theme appears to occur in the unpublished poem on *Gui de Warwick*; cf. *Modern Philology*, IV, p. 483, footnote 6.

After seven years of captivity he manages to escape and to steal Josiane from the husband whom she had been forced to wed in the meantime. Together they arrive at Haumtone and Beves conquers his heritage. Presently he must leave his home again in disgrace and go into exile. He takes his wife along, but before they have reached a definite resting-place, he is separated from her and now each seeks the other for a space of seven years. During this period Beves arrives in the city of Civile, which according to the Norse version of the story, is beset by rejected suitors for the hand of the lady of the land. Beves wins a victory, the princess falls in love with him, and he repels her advances because of his existing marriage. Finally he is forced to accept a new marriage in form which is to be consummated in reality at the end of seven years, if the first wife should still remain undiscovered at the end of that period. Before the time has elapsed, Josiane arrives in Civile and the princess is forced to accept another husband.

To be sure this outline gives no idea of the real substance of the Beves poem. Yet it is equally certain that it represents the kernel of the story, when reduced to its lowest terms. To extract it not a single feature needs to be exaggerated, no detail is transposed out of its natural order.

V

We may now consider the question whether the present dénouement of the *Eliduc* lay is natural to the story or whether it originally ended in a picture of bigamy as in the legend of the count of Gleichen, and whether this solution of the story was Christianized by Marie de France or her predecessor. The answer to this question is, however, bound up to a certain extent with the explanation of that portion of Marie's lay which leads up to the dénouement, and therefore it will be necessary as a basis for our further discussion to add in the first place an outline of the *Eliduc* story from the point where we have left it.

Called back to his home, Eliduc leaves his new love Guilliadun with the promise to return to her in the near future, and this he does as soon as circumstances permit. He meets her at night before the walls of the city, and carries her off to a ship which is

waiting for them. During the journey a storm arises, and the sailors accuse Eliduc, whose real wife they know, as being the cause of their danger. When Guilliadun hears the news she falls into a swoon so like death that Eliduc believes she has passed away. Full of anger he kills the skipper, takes hold of the helm and safely guides the boat to the shore. Enjoining secrecy upon his companions, he plans to take the body of Guilliadun to a chapel in the neighborhood of his home for burial. When he arrives there he finds that the hermit who cared for it had died shortly before, and he orders the body placed before the altar in the little church, until proper plans for the erection of an abbey or a monastery in Guilliadun's honor shall have been made.

Then he goes to his home, where his wife receives him with joy which he cannot reciprocate, for his sorrow is ever present. Every day he goes to the chapel to see the body of Guilliadun which remains lifelike and rosy. Finally the wife learns from a faithful servant the object of Eliduc's daily walk and visits the chapel herself. The sight which meets her eye tells her the secret of her husband. While she gives way to her sorrow, a weasel comes from under the altar and runs across the body of Guilliadun and the squire who had accompanied Guildeluëc kills it with a stick. Soon the mate of the weasel appears and seeing what had been done it runs into the woods and brings a red flower which it puts into the mouth of the dead animal with the result that it comes back to life. Both wife and squire now capture the red flower and as soon as they have placed it into the mouth of Guilliadun, she awakens from her long swoon. There follows a dialogue in which Guildeluëc hears of the breach of faith of her husband. With great magnanimity she announces her intention to enter a nunnery and thus give way to her rival. She takes Guilliadun back to the castle with her, and makes known her decision to Eliduc who gladly accepts the sacrifice and supplies her with the means to erect a nunnery in the neighborhood. Then he marries Guilliadun and the two live many years together, until they see the wrong which they have done, and Guilliadun withdraws to the same nunnery as Guildeluëc, while Eliduc builds a monastery to which he retires to finish his days in penitence.

The source of this portion of our lay was investigated by Nutt in an article entitled "The Lai of Eliduc and the Märchen of Little Snowwhite," in *Folklore*, Vol. III (1892), pp. 26 ff. He came to the conclusion that Marie's lay had the same antecedents as the Scotch *Märchen* of Goldtree and Silvertree. To make the discussion clear we must repeat here an outline of this story.

Silvertree, the wife, is jealous of Goldtree, the daughter. She consults a trout in a well as to who is fairest and learns it is her daughter, whereat she takes to her bed and declares one thing alone will heal her, her daughter's heart and liver. A he-goat's heart and liver are given her, and Goldtree is sent off secretly and married to a foreign king. After a year Silvertree consults the trout again and learns that her daughter is still alive. She sets sail for the foreign land and kills Goldtree by placing a poisoned dart in her finger; but so beautiful did Goldtree look that her husband did not bury her, but locked her in a room where no one could get near her. After a while he married again and the whole house was under the hand of this wife but one room, of which he himself kept the key. One day he forgot the key and the second wife got into the room. What did she find there but the most beautiful woman she ever saw. Taking the poisoned dart out of her finger Goldtree rose alive, as beautiful as she ever was. At the fall of night the prince came home downcast. "What wager," said his wife, "would you make with me that I could not make you laugh?" "Nothing could make me laugh save Goldtree to come alive." "Well, you have her alive down there in the room." When the prince saw Goldtree, he began to kiss her and kiss her and kiss her, until the second wife saw that he loved Goldtree best and said she would go away. "No," said the prince, "indeed you will not go away, but I shall have both of you." It is then told how the wicked Silvertree is punished, thanks to the second wife, and the story winds up with "the prince and his two wives were long alive after this, pleased and peaceful, and there I left them."

Criticism has been rather silent with regard to this claim. Only Warnke in his second edition of the *Lais* of Marie de France (pp. 149-150) calls attention to the fact that the story cited by Nutt is a combination of the following themes: (1) The Märchen

of *Schneewittchen*, which may also be found elsewhere joined to the story of two women loving the same man; (2) the motive of the locked room, best known from the story of Bluebeard; (3) the Eliduc story with an ending similar to that of the lay. The first wife wakens the second from her trance. She announces the fact to her husband and decides to cede her place to the second wife.

Nutt's *Märchen*, he goes on to say, shows the husband living with both wives. This he thinks is a more logical ending to a bigamy story than that of *Eliduc*, but on the other hand Marie's version stands evidently closer to the original in the way in which it relates that Eliduc came to have two wives. However, this element of the story had to disappear when the *Eliduc* theme was joined to the *Schneewittchen* motive and hence the plot of Nutt's *Märchen*.

Let us point out in the first place a vital difference between the two stories, not noted by Warnke. In the *Märchen* the husband does not commit bigamy, since his wife is apparently dead. When through the curiosity of the second wife the first comes to life again he finds himself suddenly joined to two women. But no wrong has been committed; in fact through the resuscitation of the first wife a previous crime has been righted, and since heaven has thus directly caused the confusion, it would seem to follow that no disapproval could fall upon the hero if he accepts the irregular relation, though his doubts as to the morality of it are voiced by the intention of the second wife to cede her place. In other words the solution of the *Märchen* is perfectly logical in a story which is made up through a combination of the *Schneewittchen* with the *Bluebeard* theme.

I doubt whether the *Eliduc* story has anything to do with this *Märchen*. The attitude of the husband is different, the rôles of the women are inverted, and the keynote of its plot is jealousy of the stepmother (the *Schneewittchen* theme). The only real similarity is the trance and resuscitation of Guilliadun, and in addition the bigamous relation of Eliduc, if indeed Marie's story shows an altered and younger dénouement, a question to which the answer should not be given without further consideration. Let us attempt

to find this answer on the basis of the data which we have established.

We have shown the presence of the exile formula in the lay and have also established a strong presumption in favor of the fact that the original story contained a duplication of this theme. We have further shown that the resemblance theme was joined to this reduplication. It follows that Eliduc must commit at the second court actions in conflict with the troth plighted during the first exile. In other words, like Gurun, Galeran, and Tristan he must be ready to neglect his first love. The main difference in his case lies in the fact that he is actually married, and this feature shows that we are dealing with a younger form of the story.

Granting that he persists in his attitude of being willing to forget his duty to his wife, we may consider the possibilities of the situation brought about by this new combination. When he leaves the court of Exeter we may ask what he can do with Guilliadun and what will be the attitude of his wife. With reference to the first question it is evident that he can either (1) bring the second woman to his home, or (2) establish the newcomer near his home and try to live in secret in this double relation. The first wife will either (1) accept the double relation, or (2) cede her place to her rival.

With reference to the first question scrutiny of the poem indicates that the second part of the alternative stated above fits properly into the story. Eliduc knows that he is doing wrong, for he thinks of his wife (ll. 322-26), he conceals her existence at the court of Exeter, and finally decides to keep his faith to her in fact, but to approach the point of breaking it as closely as he can (ll. 463-77). When he is called home by his first lord the only logical method for him to pursue is to continue his previous concealment. All the probabilities, therefore, are in favor of the belief that the source of Marie's poem related that Eliduc brought Guilliadun to the neighborhood of his home.

The answer to the second query presents a little more difficulty for either solution of the dilemma would form a satisfactory end to the story. In general, however, scholars have declared themselves more or less clearly in favor of the view that the original climax

of the story was bigamous, and that Marie de France has altered it, or that it had already been altered in her immediate source under the influence of Christianity. The question became in addition complicated with the further problem of the geographical source of this tradition. Nutt endeavored to show that the bigamy of Eliduc represents a remnant of the practice of bigamy among the ancient Celts, Gaston Paris inclined to western origin "dans un milieu où la monogamie était un devoir strict de l'homme et un droit sacré de la femme,"¹ while Bayot, finally, cites the Indian drama *Vikramorvaçi* of the sixth century of our era,² which appears to present in its central theme some analogies with the legend under consideration.

When we consider the lay of *Eliduc* in relation to the other texts of the group to which it clearly belongs, we shall see, however, that the solution which this poem brings is in perfect harmony with that found in the others. The same readiness on the part of one of the two women involved to cede her place to the newcomer is evident in them all. What the *Tristan* story would have been if the first Isolt had arrived before the death of Tristan we cannot imagine, but the other texts are clear. The *Roman de Galeran*, which has preserved the resemblance theme in its purest form, relates that Florie entered a cloister, and in the same way Lenburc in the Anglo-Norman song of *Horn* at once expresses her wish to withdraw to a nunnery as soon as she discovers her hero's love for Rigmel. There can be no question, however, that even here in both cases the solution is Christianized. Its older form appears in the other poems. In the *Lai du Fraisne*, the source of the *Roman de Galeran*, La Coldre simply cedes her place and eventually finds another husband; similarly in the English *King Horn* the hero at once proposes another marriage for Lenburc; in the *Beves* story the duchess of Civile accepts another husband than the one that she had selected; and also in the *Griselidis* legend the submissive first wife accepts the substitution of a younger rival. Everything, therefore, seems to speak in favor of the conclusion that in this particular, as well as in the others that we have noted earlier, the *Eliduc* lay is in harmony with the poems

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 127.

² *Op. cit.* p. 102.

to which it belongs and that the present dénouement, though evidently Christianized in that the rejected wife selects a nunnery as her place of refuge, is that which belonged to the original story.

It should be noted, in the next place, that the various poems of our group belong geographically closely together. Marie refers distinctly to a Celtic lay; the home of Ille is in Bretagne; Galeran is born in Nantes, and similarly the scene of the *Lai du Fraisne* lies in Bretagne. All the stories considered here, *Horn et Rimenhild* included, evidently belong to a region in which the Celtic substratum could exert decisive influence. Whether the dénouement that these stories present rests upon an earlier form involving bigamy, we are not prepared to say. This phase of the problem rests upon considerations which we have neither the competence nor the data to discuss. This much, however, is clear, that unless it should be distinctly proved that the Celts originally practiced bigamy, which does not seem to have been done so far,¹ such a condition is not necessary for the explanation of our stories. All appear perfectly clear if accepted as resting upon an older and more primitive habit of society in which a wife could be pushed aside for a new and more favorite rival, which is imperfectly Christianized in Marie's lay, and which appears clearly in the *Lai du Fraisne* and perhaps also in the *Griselidis* legend.

With these facts in mind we can readily understand how the *Eliduc* lay, based in its essence upon the framework which we have uncovered, attracted the elements for which the other members of our group present no parallels. The discovery by Guildeluëc of her husband's double relation by chance or curiosity, probably the latter, suggested the "Bluebeard" story. There, it will be remembered, curiosity leads the wife to discover the dead bodies of her predecessors. If this point of view is accurate, we can understand why Guildeluëc should find Guilliadun in a trance. In the next place an explanation of this apparent death was called for, and this brought in the motive of the trance and resuscitation, a widely scattered theme discussed with abundant detail by Köhler.² To explain the trance itself, the story of the

¹ For the attitude of the Celts toward marriage cf. Bedier, *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas*, Vol. II, p. 163.

² See Warnke's edition of Marie's *Lais*, pp. 154 ff.

storm due to Eliduc's guilt and the consequences to which it gave rise may have been added in the next place. The cause of this addition lies probably in the fact that in the simplest form of the story Eliduc brought his new love to his home. Here we have another widely scattered tradition, discussed equally fully by Köhler.¹ The religious and Christian tone of this motive, however, indicates a more recent date for its introduction.

Summing up our conclusions, we may say that the *Eliduc* lay is made up of a reduplication of the exile formula combined with the resemblance theme. The union of these two elements makes it practically certain that the present dénouement of the lay in its essence represents the original solution. At a later stage this story attracts the "Bluebeard" theme and the other widely scattered traditions of the trance and resuscitation, as well as that of the stormy sea-voyage caused by the moral guilt of one of the occupants of the boat.

VI

We are now prepared to discuss the relation of *Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies* and of the legend of the count of Gleichen to the earlier forms of this tradition.

With reference to the former, Gaston Paris believed (*op. cit.*, p. 124), "que le roman hennuyer repose sur une forme de la tradition semblable à celle d'où est sorti le lai breton." Bayot, in the study of this legend already cited (pp. 65 ff.) goes a step farther and sees in the *Eliduc* lay itself the principal source of the rimed version from which the prose in turn derives. The accuracy of this claim he tries to establish by a long list of parallel passages in which he sees resemblances between the lay and the fifteenth-century prose. Moreover, he believes that the indebtedness of the author of the rimed *Gillion de Trazegnies* to Marie de France goes farther, and that traces of the *Lai du Fraisne* and of *Milun* can be discovered by a similar minute analysis. However, this portion of Bayot's study fails to be convincing. The resemblances which he notes are not close enough to prove actual dependence of the younger text upon the older, and in fact are

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 151 ff.

just such as we should expect to find if the relation between them were that accepted by Gaston Paris. And until more definite proof to the contrary can be shown we shall continue to believe that both the *Eliduc* lay and the *Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies* derive from the same common source. This last form of the story related the Eliduc tradition as we have unraveled it and without the later additions. Of this version some traits have remained unchanged in the prose novel. Gillion leaves his wife and arrives at a foreign court where he renders valuable service in repelling the attack of a rejected suitor for the hand of a princess who falls in love with him. He accepts her advances, and brings her to his home. Other features of the story have been modernized under the influence of Christianity and the Crusades. Gillion's journey becomes a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and his stay at the foreign court is conceived of as being due to captivity among the Saracens. He remains faithful to his marriage vow until he has reason to believe that his wife has died, and when this illusion is cleared up by the arrival of his sons, the second wife accompanies him to his home with full knowledge and in the expectation of a hostile reception.

The closest similarity, however, persists in the final dénouement. Both the first wife and the newcomer withdraw to the same nunnery, and the hero enters a monastery. That this life of penitence is here begun at once, while in the *Eliduc* lay several years intervene between the monastic vows of Guildeluëc and those of Guilliadun and Eliduc changes the solution in spirit, but not in fact. Bigamy, in the proper sense of the term, is, therefore, absent from both stories, though it is clear that Eliduc, with his more primitive attitude toward woman, may be looked upon as an example of a husband with two wives. Yet it becomes very evident that this name fits the relation inadequately when the dénouement of the legend of the count of Gleichen is placed by the side of *Eliduc* and *Gillion de Trazegnies*.

Here it is related that by a papal dispensation the hero lived for many years in peace and joy with his two wives. Now Bayot has shown very clearly¹ that this variant of our legend is quite young.

¹ Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 81 ff.

The first reference to it appears in the year 1539 in the argument which the landgrave Philip of Hesse, whose first wife was still living, addressed to Luther and Melanchthon in order to induce them to authorize his marriage with Margaret von der Saal. In that document we find only a brief allusion to this tradition. The full account appears seven years later in 1546. There can be no question, however, that Bayot's contention is exact and that the later full version derives from the French prose novel of the fifteenth century. In that case the dénouement of the German story was not contained in the source, and we may look for the causes which probably were potent in introducing the alteration.

The question of polygamy was widely discussed during the period of the Reformation and was, indeed, to a certain extent, a living issue at that time. In fact it is evident that considerable uncertainty with reference to it existed both in the Catholic and in the Protestant Church.¹ One of the earliest causes of this discussion was the divorce of Henry VIII of England. The *impedimentum affinitatis* upon which it turned (Catherine of Aragon had been the wife of Arthur, Henry's deceased brother) had opened up the whole question and had led the German reformers to take decided positions in the matter. Those who were disinclined to recognize the illegality of the first marriage, or to countenance a divorce were led to look upon a double marriage as a possible solution of the dilemma. Luther and Melanchthon were of this group.² Henry raised the question whether the pope could give a dispensation for a bigamous marriage and Clemens at one time virtually agreed to give such a permission, and certainly Cajetan³ seems to have believed with Luther and the reformers that such a proceeding would be entirely possible and legal. The whole discussion turned upon the prohibition of divorce and whether polygamy is absolutely forbidden by the teaching of Christ.

These circumstances explain the revival of this story in Germany at that time and also present the key to the variations which our legend contains in this its youngest form. There was a vague and poorly understood tradition in Erfurt connected with a tomb-

¹ Cf. Rockwell, *Die Doppelehe des Landgrafen von Hessen*, Marburg, 1904.

² Rockwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-78.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 305.

stone on which a man was pictured reclining between two women, presumably his wives, but in succession and not simultaneously. This tradition had become attached to a member of the family of Gleichen. A similar tomb in the Hainaut had caused a simpler form of the *Eliduc* story to be attached to the house of Trazegnies. When Philip of Hesse was agitating for his bigamous marriage, attention was directed to this tombstone and vague tradition. It was used by him as an argument in his favor, and in consequence the French story, which may have been unknown in Germany until that time, became directly attached to this new center and soon showed evidence of the influence of its new surroundings. Philip of Hesse, when he cites it, together with the marriage of Henry VIII, as precedents for his own case, mentions already the two principal variations which the tradition had undergone, viz., the dispensation of the pope and the bigamous union.¹ But this new form did not find a full expression until the year 1546 and then we find the whole legend readjusted so as to appear to sanction the bigamous marriage of Philip, to which both Luther and Melancthon had in the meantime given their assent.

If this point of view is correct, and everything speaks in its favor, the German legend cannot be adduced in an argument tending to show the *dénouement* of the original form of the *Eliduc* lay, as indeed has been done, the question of the existence or absence among the early Celts of the practice of bigamy has no place in the argument, and in fact the legend of the husband with two wives, if this phrase be taken in its narrowest sense, has no place in Old French literature.

NOTE.—In the footnote on p. 109 of the article cited, Gaston Paris promised a comprehensive study of our legend and cited the story of *Notre Dame de Liesse* as an important member of the cycle which he intended to discuss. This legend relates that three knights of the family of Eppes in Picardy near Laon fell into the hands of the Saracens and became prisoners of the sultan. The latter tried every means in his power to induce them to deny their Christian faith. Finally he sent his daughter Ismerie to them in the hope that her physical charms might lead the Christian knights to forswear their faith. However, the result was con-

¹ "So hat der Pabst selbst einen Grafen von Gleichen, welcher zum heiligen Grab gewesen und in Erfahrung kommen, sein Weib solle todt sein, deswegen er eine andere nahm, zugelassen, dass er sie alle Beide mocht behalten."—Bayot, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

trary to his expectations. Ismerie became interested in the faith of the Christians, and when she heard them speak of the charms of Notre Dame she expressed the wish that she might see a statue of her. The knights then promised to carve one for her, if she would furnish them with wood and knife. But they had promised more than they could fulfil, for they did not know the art of carving, and wearied with their efforts and with a prayer on their lips they fell asleep. During the night a bright light filled their gloomy prison, and Notre Dame in person brought her statue. When Ismerie saw the image on the following day she was converted, and all now planned to escape to France. Again Notre Dame lent her aid. The three knights with Ismerie and the statue were miraculously carried during their sleep to their native land, where Ismerie was baptized, and a church was erected at Liesse near Laon in honor of Notre Dame and her miraculous statue (cf. *Image de Notre Dame de Liesse, ou son histoire authentique* par un religieux de la Compagnie de Jésus, Reims, 1632; *Nouvelle Histoire de Notre Dame de Liesse*, Laon, 1858; Les abbés E. et A. Duployé, *Notre Dame de Liesse, Légende et pèlerinage*, 2 vols., Reims, 1862).

It is evident that this legend lacks the essential feature of the stories under discussion. Yet knowing the accuracy of Gaston Paris in matters of this kind, it is impossible to believe that we have to do with a lapse of memory or a faulty reference. On looking closely it is also evident that several points of contact with the legend of *Gillion de Trazegnies* are clearly present. The Christian knights are in captivity among the Saracens, they owe their lives to the interest of a Saracen princess, and they finally return to their native land accompanied by the Saracen woman, who has accepted their faith. It is possible, therefore, that Gaston Paris conceived of the *Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies* as being the result of a mixture of the *Eliduc* tradition with the theme evident in the legend of *Notre Dame de Liesse*. His death makes it impossible to know what his intentions were or to say how he looked upon the problem, and the impossibility of submitting the solution offered here to his criticism, the consciousness that the eyes that saw so clearly are closed, and that the fountain of help that flowed so freely has ceased, overpowers me as I write the closing lines of this study amidst the scenes of his activity. The sense of personal loss which we all felt when he was taken from us is with me during this first visit to Paris since his death, and I cannot close this note without paying tribute to the memory of this scholar who became the teacher and the friend of all who had the good fortune to come in contact with him.

JOHN E. MATZKE

LELAND STANFORD JR. UNIVERSITY